

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of April 11, 2007

Members Present: Alice Keller, Jay Winer, Todd Williams, Rob Moody, Jack Bebbler, Diane Duermit, Alice Coppedge, Scott Riviere, Lupe Perez

Members Absent: Amanda Starcher, Cheryl McMurry, Suzanne Jones, John Cram, Marsha Shortell

Staff: Stacy Merten, Curt Euler, Jennifer Blevins

Public: Nicole Mitchell, Hunter Kalman, Jennifer Harris, Jody Kuhne, Doug Smith, Geoff Ray, Eric Diener, David Aiton, Scott Carter, John Legerton, John Murrell-Kisner, Ron Pell, Tim Harrison

Call to Order: Chair Winer called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m. He told the attendees that the meeting would begin with the preliminary reviews because there weren't enough Commissioners present to make up a quorum.

Preliminary Review:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Nicole Mitchell
Subject Property: 74 Magnolia Steet
Hearing Date: April 11, 2007
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.13-13-5124
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She pointed out that asphalt paving is not permitted. She also noted that the floor plans showed a chimney, but none was shown on the elevations and that the fenestration proposed is not typical for the district.
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Nicole Mitchell, the property owner, asked what types of driveway materials are permitted. She explained that the fireplace will be ventless so it won't require a chimney. She displayed photographs of 2 over 1 windows and some with smaller panes similar to her drawings. She said she would look for a precedent with the windows used together as shown on her drawings.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion	
The Commissioners told Ms. Mitchell that concrete, gravel or two lane brick or concrete tracks with grass in the middle would be appropriate for the driveway. Some were concerned that the proposed windows gave the impression of a transom. The also asked that she bring a sample of the cultured stone to the final review.	
Commission Action	
None	

Commissioner Duermit entered the meeting room at 4:15 p.m. and Chair Winer stated that a quorum was present.

Public Hearing:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Mark & Jennifer Harris
Subject Property: 50 Cumberland Ave.
Hearing Date: April 11, 2007
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.17-11-9893
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She told the Commissioners that the new drawings were to scale and clearly depicted what the applicant proposed. She confirmed that the windows will be simulated divided light and asked for window specifications.
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Jennifer Harris, the applicant, passed out copies of revised elevations showing wider shed dormers on the two sides and asked if the Commissioners would consider the change.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion	
The Commissioners agreed that the change to the dormers was an improvement because the main house has the same element.	
Commission Action	
<p>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</p> <p>Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – materials list; Exhibit B – storage building specifications; Exhibit C – 3 photographs; Exhibit D – site plan; Exhibit E – new construction checklist, Exhibit F – 4 elevations; Exhibit G – floor plans; Exhibit H – revised site plan, Exhibit I – revised materials list; Exhibit J – revised drawings dated 3/28/07, including 4 elevations and 2 floor plans; Exhibit K – revised drawings dated 4/11/07; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p>	

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of February, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 28th day of February, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits L and M.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to construct a new two-story 16' x 24' accessory structure on slab foundation in same location as existing 1-story accessory structure, per attached drawings. New structure will have horizontal wood lap siding with a 6" reveal and cedar shakes above with a gambrel style roof to match main house. Roof will be asphalt shingle, "Aspen Green" to match main house. Windows & door surrounds to match main structure. Windows will be wood, SDL, 6 over 6, double-hung. New structure will be painted to match house. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Outbuildings found on pages 51-53 in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. New accessory structure will be compatible with the main structure in terms of scale, form and materials.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Moody
Second by: Commissioner Duermit
Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following condition:**
The applicant will submit window specifications to staff for review and approval.

Motion by: Commissioner Moody
Second by: Commissioner Duermit
Vote for: All

Adoption of Minutes:

Commissioner Duermit made a motion to adopt the March, 2007 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Moody
Vote for: All

Adoption of St. Dunstan's draft guidelines:

Ms. Merten suggested that the draft guidelines should be adopted in their current form and then amended to incorporate the green building standards and make any other changes necessary.

Commissioner Duermit made a motion to adopt the draft guidelines as written.

Second by: Commissioner Riviere

Vote for: All

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Jody Kuhne
Subject Property: 76 Starnes Avenue
Hearing Date: April 11, 2007
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.18-21-5940
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Subdivision Approval, Building, Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She explained that once the garage addition is built, the new single-family dwelling previously approved for the Flint Street side of the parcel would no longer be appropriate because the two structures would be too close together. She asked Jody Kuhne, the applicant, to voluntarily withdraw the Certificate of Appropriateness that was issued for the house. She noted that door specifications would be required for the garage.
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Mr. Kuhne came forward and stated that he wished to withdraw his request to build the single-family dwelling.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
The Commissioners agreed that the CA should be withdrawn.	
Commission Action	
MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT	
<p>Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – 2 sheets window specifications; Exhibit B – 4 elevations; Exhibit C – site plan; Exhibit D – recorded copy of recombination plat; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <p>1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of February, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 28th day of February, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits E and F.</p>	

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. Application is to construct addition to existing accessory structure. The resulting structure will be 480 sq. ft. and all materials will match existing per the attached drawings. Windows will be Jeld-Wen wood, SDL, casement windows and doors will be 36" wood construction, 9-light, SDL. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Outbuildings found on pages 51-53 in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The proposed alterations to the accessory structure remain compatible with the historic character of the main building in terms of scale, proportion roof forms and materials.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Riviere
Second by: Commissioner Perez
Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following condition:**
The applicant will submit door specifications to staff for review and approval.

Motion by: Commissioner Riviere
Second by: Commissioner Perez
Vote for: All

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Douglas Smith
Subject Property: 117 Flint Street
Hearing Date: April 11, 2007
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.17-22-4440
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She said that window specifications were required. She noted that the lower portion of the proposed enclosure should be sided with
-----------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	shingles to be consistent with the rest of the upper story of the house. She asked if there was any other way to correct the water problem.
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Mr. Douglas Smith, the property owner, told the Commissioners that he had explored many options for correcting the problem, but all of them would alter the look of the porch. He said that enclosure seemed to be the best and most permanent solution to prevent further damage to the structure. He told the Commissioners that he would like to use salvaged double-hung windows instead of those shown on his drawings.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
There was discussion about whether double-hung windows would achieve the same look as casement windows and it was decided that the porch would resemble a sleeping porch with either type of window. They agreed that the proposed work would be an appropriate way to prevent damage to the original historic structure.	
Commission Action	
MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT	
<p>Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – 4 photographs; Exhibit B – 3 sheets floor plans; Exhibit C – 4 elevations; Exhibit D – revised elevations dated 3/28/07; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of February, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 28th day of February, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits E and F. 2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members. 3. Application is to enclose a small portion of an upper level non-original south side rear porch, to provide a water proof ceiling to existing heated space on main level. New windows will be salvaged, wood, double-hung, TDL 6 over 1. Siding will be shingles to match the existing siding on the upper level of the house. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence. 4. That the guidelines for Porches, Entrances and Balconies found on pages 28-29 in <i>The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District</i> adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request. 	

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The enclosure will help to correct a water problem created from a poorly constructed previous addition.
2. The porch will resemble a sleeping porch.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Riviere
Second by: Commissioner Coppedge
Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following conditions:**

1. **The applicant will submit revised drawings showing the window change to staff for review and approval.**
2. **The applicant will submit photographs of salvaged windows or specifications for new windows to staff for review and approval.**

Motion by: Commissioner Riviere
Second by: Commissioner Bebbler
Vote for: All

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Elizabeth Graham/Eric Diener
Subject Property: Houston Street
Hearing Date: April 11, 2007
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.17-01-4485
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She told the Commissioners that the applicant, Eric Diener, has found some precedents in the neighborhood for the bay window. She said that Mr. Diener has also requested the removal of a tree. She said the city arborist hasn't examined the tree yet, but it is leaning and there is concern that it may be further compromised during construction. She asked for clarification on the porch piers and for a landscape plan.
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Mr. Diener passed out copies of revised drawings. He pointed out the changes made since the preliminary review. He explained that the architect failed to remove the transom on the rear door from the new drawings. He said that he has decided to leave the one bay window on the right side and use a shed roof. He explained that the site plan still shows the originally proposed window, but that the window will be

	squared off. He said he had decided to use 3 over 1 windows. He clarified that the chimney and the porch piers will be stucco. He displayed material samples, including the asphalt roof shingle, hardi-plank siding, Miratec trim and cedar shingles and passed around the paint color samples.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
The Commissioners thanked Mr. Diener for addressing their concerns. Commissioner Duermit asked for further clarification on the porch piers. They also stressed the importance of foundation plantings.	
Commission Action	
MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT	
<p>Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 2/19/07, including new construction checklist, 4 elevations, floor plans, photograph of exterior lighting fixture, site plan and setback comparison; Exhibit B – revised elevations dated 3/28/07; Exhibit C – 5 photographs of bay windows; Exhibit D – material samples; Exhibit E – storyboard; Exhibit F – color scheme; Exhibit G – revised drawings dated 4/11/07; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of March, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 29th day of March, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits H and I. 2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members. 3. Application is to construct new 1500 sq. ft. single family dwelling with front porch on concrete block/stucco foundation per attached plans. New structure will have hardi-plank horizontal lap siding on 1st floor and cedar shingles above. Porch will have tongue & groove floor and ceiling with 6” X 6” posts on 12” base. Railing will have 2” X 2” posts, 3.5” on center. Other details include 3” projection/flair at bottom of shingles, frieze boards in gable rakes, corner boards, window and door surrounds and bay windows. Roof will be 9/12 with an 18” overhang, architectural asphalt shingles in Weatherwood, and have boxed cornices, and applied aluminum gutters. Chimney will be stucco. Windows will be wood, double hung, three over 1, SDL. Front door will be wood. Lighting per attached specifications. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence. 	

4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Residential Structures found on pages 56-58, Vegetation found on page 50, Chimneys found on page 40, and Decks found on page 31 in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The new structure is appropriately setback to accommodate changes in elevation
2. The proposed new structure will be compatible with the district in terms of scale, materials and texture.
3. The applicant has submitted documentation showing precedence for the bay windows.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Bebbber

Second by: Commissioner Keller

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following conditions:**

1. **The applicant will submit revised elevations showing the removal of the transom and clearer detail of the porch piers to staff for review and approval.**
2. **The applicant will submit a landscape plan to staff for review and approval.**

Motion by: Commissioner Bebbber

Second by: Commissioner Williams

Vote for: All

Commissioner Duermit made a motion to recuse Commissioners Moody and Bebbber.

Second by: Commissioner Williams

Vote for: All

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: ELCO Properties/EcoBuilders, Inc., Rob Moody
Subject Property: 84 St. Dunstan's Road
Hearing Date: April 11, 2007
Historic District: St. Dunstan's
PIN: 9648.19-51-2792
Zoning District: RS-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report.
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Rob Moody, the applicant, passed out revised drawings. He gave a powerpoint presentation detailing the changes to the plan since the preliminary review, including the removal of the parking deck

	and the change from casement to double-hung type for several of the windows. He explained that the steel girders and posts won't be visible from the street. He passed around a photograph of the asphalt roof shingle and pointed out the drawing of the proposed railing design. He displayed the updated storyboard, outdoor lighting fixture and listed the other exterior materials. He passed out copies of a concept landscape plan drawn by the homeowner.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
<p>The Commissioners discussed the landscape plan and it was noted that the parking area shown was larger than that shown on the site plan. Mr. Moody withdrew the landscape plan and said he would submit a revised plan to staff. The Commissioners asked for clarification on the height of the retaining wall and placement of the handrail. They asked Mr. Moody to try to design the front walkway so that no railing is required by the building code and he agreed. They asked about the chimney and Mr. Moody said it will be boxed and covered with pebbledash, with a vent cap at the top.</p>	
Commission Action	
MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT	
<p>Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 2/28/07, including new construction checklist, site plan, floor plans, dimension plans, elevations and building sections; Exhibit B – streetscape; Exhibit C – sheets dated 3/14/07, including graphic images, exterior lighting specifications, photographs of pebbledash, cedar shingles, cement fiber siding, Miratec trim, asphalt roof shingles and ceramic tiles; Exhibit D – printout of powerpoint presentation dated 3/14/07; Exhibit E – revised elevations dated 3/28/07; Exhibit F – photograph of roof shingle; Exhibit G – packet of revised drawings dated 4/11/07; Exhibit H – revised powerpoint presentation; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of March, 2007 and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 29th day of March, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits I and J. 2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members. 3. Application is to construct new two-story single family dwelling on concrete block/pebbledash foundation with pedestrian bridge and rear decks per attached plans. New structure will have hardi-plank horizontal lap siding on 1st floor and cedar shingles above. Other details include front window bump out with tile accents, brackets and corner trim. Front porch 	

will have railings as shown on revised drawing dated 4/11/07. Multi gable roof with architectural asphalt shingles. Chimney will be pebbledash stucco. Windows will be double hung, aluminum clad, one over one. Front door will be wood per attached specifications. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the Draft guidelines for New Construction, Driveways and Off-Street Parking and Chimneys were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The new structure maintains the same relationship of house to street as the historic structures in the neighborhood.
2. The house is constructed with minimal disturbance to the land contours.
3. The house is compatible with the neighborhood in terms of scale and massing
4. The proposed structure is compatible with the spirit and intent of the St. Dunstan's District.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the St. Dunstan's Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Williams

Second by: Commissioner Riviere

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued/denied with the following condition:**

The applicant will submit a landscape plan to staff for review and approval.

Motion by: Commissioner Williams

Second by: Commissioner Riviere

Vote for: All

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: John Kisner
Subject Property: 98 A Flint Street
Hearing Date: April 11, 2007
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.17-22-3163
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She requested window and door specifications. She said she felt that the proposed parking area would be appropriate because the house is second tier development, behind the houses fronting on the street.
Applicant(s) or	John Kisner, the architect, passed around specifications for the Marvin

Applicant Representative(s)	wood windows and displayed the roof shingle sample. He said that three of the windows on the front of the existing house are in very poor condition and asked if one or two Commissioners could visit the site to help determine if they were deteriorated beyond repair. He said that both the pedestrian and carriage house doors would be custom built and the utility room door would be a stock solid wood door.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
Commissioners Williams and Riviere volunteered to examine the windows. They asked Mr. Kisner if the custom built doors would match the design shown in his drawings and he confirmed that they would. The Commissioners thanked him for addressing their concerns noted in the preliminary review.	
Commission Action	
<p>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</p> <p>Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 12/18/06, including copy of Sanborn map, existing and proposed site plans, 12 photographs and 2 elevations; Exhibit B – preliminary application package dated 1/23/07, including existing and proposed site plans, floor plans, 4 elevations and 12 photographs; Exhibit C – final application package dated 3/20/07, including new construction checklist, flexible development application, existing and proposed site plans, 3 sheets floor plans, 3 sheets elevations, building section and 6 photographs; Exhibit D – roof shingle sample; Exhibit E – window specifications; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of March, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 29th day of March, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits F and G. 2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members. 3. Application is to restore existing cottage per attached plans to conform to original footprint on Sanborn maps. Work to include: 1) demolition of altered front porch and addition; 2) rebuild original porch and south wing with massing and details to match original. Construct new carriage house and add off street parking per attached plans. Structure will have horizontal hardi-plank siding on primary level with cedar shakes on 2nd story, clipped gable, asphalt shingle roof (English gray slate) and exposed rafter tails. Windows will be wood 3 over 1 double hung. Carriage doors will be wood and glass as shown on plans. Construct three parking spaces with 	

crushed stone surface. Apply flexible development to allow encroachment into side and rear setback. 1) Construct new wing on house with setback to match existing house setback of 1' 6"; 2) new carriage house will be 3' off the side and 3' 6" off rear property line. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Outbuildings found on pages 51-53, the guidelines for Porches, Entrances & Balconies found on pages 28-30, Driveways and Off-Street Parking found on pages 44-45 and Additions found on page 55 in *The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District* adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has submitted evidence of the former footprint of the existing structure
2. The applicant has submitted evidence of precedence in Montford of a two-story accessory structure with a one-story house and has designed the accessory structure to be proportional to the main structure.
3. The proposed setbacks are compatible with the Sanborn maps.
4. The proposed parking is located behind the primary tier structures on the street and is compatible with the neighborhood pattern, although located in front of the secondary tier structures.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Perez

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following condition:**

The deteriorated windows will be examined by two Commissioners to determine if they can be replaced.

Motion by: Commissioner Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Williams

Vote for: All

Preliminary Reviews:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant:	Geoff & Lisa Ray
Subject Property:	303 Cumberland Avenue
Hearing Date:	April 11, 2007
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.13-04-3598
Zoning District:	RS-8
Other Permits:	Building & Zoning

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She said that if the porch were more typical the proposed enclosure would probably not be appropriate. She pointed out that the rest of the house is on a continuous foundation and the porch is on piers, so it appears to be non-original.
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	Geoff Ray, the applicant, said that the porch roof is rotting and sagging and would require extensive repair whether or not it is enclosed.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
The Commissioners discussed the porch and agreed that it was added sometime after the house was built. They all agreed that the proposed enclosure would be a great improvement.	
Commission Action	
None	

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Steven Moberg
Subject Property: 56 Patton Avenue, S & W Cafeteria Building
Hearing Date: April 11, 2007
Historic District: Downtown Area
PIN: 9649.18-6121
Zoning District: Local Historic Landmark
Other Permits: Building

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards require additions to be set back from the primary elevation and differentiated from the historic structure.
Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)	David Aiton, the architect, said that the Building Safety Department has determined that the existing structure will support a fourth floor. He displayed floor plans, a building section and photographs of the existing structure with the proposed addition sketched in. He stated that the existing parapet wall extends 9' above the roof and that the addition will be set back 15' from the front elevation. He showed perspective views from several locations. He said that all HVAC equipment would be placed in a recessed area of the roof of the addition and would be completely out of sight. He told the Commissioners that he would welcome suggestions on the exterior materials and asked if the Commission would approve the interior work as well.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	

Ms. Merten said that the interior work wouldn't be reviewed by the Commission because the designation did not include anything inside the building. Commissioner Riviere pointed out that Douglas Ellington purposely stopped the building at three stories to preserve the view of the steeple from Haywood Street. He noted that the majority of the view would be maintained with the proposed addition. The Commissioners discussed the proposed dormers and several were very concerned that they would compete with the existing architecture. There was also concern about the appearance of the right side of the roof from Patton Avenue and it was suggested that a less prominent roof form would be more appropriate. The Commissioners present all agreed that they would be able to approve the addition if it was designed in accordance with the Secretary's Standards.

Most of the Commissioners present said they would like to meet with Mr. Aiton at the site to discuss design alternatives. It was decided that a special meeting would be announced so that any number of them could attend without violating the open meetings law.

Commissioner Coppedge told Mr. Aiton that he shouldn't tell potential buyers of the condominium units that they would be eligible for a reduction in taxes. Ms. Merten pointed out that the tax deferral issue was not in the purview of the HRC, but that it was good information to share with the applicant.

Commission Action

None

Other Business:

Ms. Merten told the Commissioners that the Preservation Month website is operational and passed out flyers and posters for them to distribute.

She asked the Commissioners and they agreed that the Sondley Award should be presented to Ms. Brezny at the Griffin Awards ceremony on May 24th at the Grove Park Country Club.

She also told the Commissioners that the Parks and Recreation Department's budget would be insufficient to maintain the Killian House so she plans to work with the Preservation Society so that the structure can be saved.

Commissioner Duermit made a motion to adjourn.

Second by: Commissioner Moody

Vote for: All

Chair Winer adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.